

REMARKS

Applicants have made amendments and cancellations to the claims in order to pursue a preferred embodiment of the invention at this time. Claims 1 – 33 have been cancelled. New claims 34-38 have been added.

Support for amendment of the claims and the new claims can be found throughout the specification and originally filed claims.

Support for new claim 34 is found, for example, at numbered paragraphs [0025], [0032], [0040], [0068], [0070].

Support for new claim 35 is found, for example, at numbered paragraphs [0027], [0032], [0068], [0070].

Support for new claim 36 is found, for example, at original claim 4, numbered paragraph [0027].

Support for new claims 37 and 38 is found, for example, at numbered paragraphs [0030], [0070].

Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments.

Rejection of Claims under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 117, 27-30 and 32-33 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as not enabled by the specification. In a telephone conference between Applicant's attorney and the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that the instant application enabled a method of promoting neuronal outgrowth in a neuron comprising contacting the neuron with D-mannose. To that end, pending claims have been cancelled, and new claims 34-38 have been submitted. New claim 34 recites "a method of promoting neuronal outgrowth in a neuron comprising contacting the neuron with D-mannose." New claims 35-38 depend from claim 34, and add further limitations. Support for these new limitations is provided directly above. Applicants submit that new claims 34-38 are enabled by the specification and respectfully request consideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner has maintained the provisional rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7-11 and 20-12 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 31-32 and 34-37 of copending Application No. 10/580,364 ('364). Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance until an indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 22-26 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 18-20 and 22 of co-pending Application No. 11/804,295 ('295). Applicant requests that this rejection be held in abeyance until an indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-6, 10, 15-17 and 21-22, and 28-33 on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-4, 7-10 and 12-13 of U.S. Patent no. 6,855,690 ('690). Applicants submit concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer which obviates this rejection.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 22-26 on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent no. 7,238,529 ('529). Applicants submit concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer which obviates this rejection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 USC 102

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Sherman et al. (U.S. 4,471,114). Applicants submit that this rejection has been obviated by cancellation of claim 22.

SUMMARY

In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees and credit any overpayments that may be due in connection with this submission to Nixon Peabody LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0850.

Date: September 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 50828

/Shayne Y. Huff/
David S. Resnick (Reg. No. 34,235)
Shayne Y. Huff (Reg. No. 44,784)
NIXON PEABODY LLP
Tel: (617) 345-1000
Fax: (617) 345-1300